

**University of Glasgow**  
**Transforming Research Management Project Board**  
**Minutes of the meeting held on Friday 27<sup>th</sup> January 2012**  
**09:00 - 11:30 Room 356 Gilbert Scott Building**

**Present:** Professor Steve Beaumont, Vice Principal, Research & Enterprise  
Professor Muffy Calder, Dean of Research, SE  
Mr Robert Fraser, Director of Finance (Convener)  
Miss Alice Gee, Head of Research Administration, MVLS  
Ms Joanne Hulley, Head of Research Support  
Ms Julie Lee, Head of Systems Support & Development  
Dr Catherine Martin, College Secretary, Arts  
Professor Graeme Milligan, Dean of Research, MVLS  
Mr Gordon Scott, Human Resources Policy Dev. Manager  
Professor Catherine Schenk, Dean of Research, SS  
Professor Adrienne Scullion, Dean of Research, Arts  
Mrs Louise Virdee, College Research Administration Manager, SS

**Apologies:** No apologies

**Attending:** Miss Karen Jack, Project Administrator (Clerk)

### **1 Minutes of the Last Meeting**

Minutes of the last meeting dated Wednesday 30 November 2011 were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

### **2 Matters Arising**

Actions from the last meeting were followed up as follows:-

- Joanne Hulley (JH) reported that [REDACTED] had not yet provided an update, but she believed that the issue referred to academics that took on additional roles such as peer review but did not feel that this was recognised in P&DR.
- Robert Fraser (RF) reported that meetings had been held with board members
- JH reported that Deloitte output documentation had been circulated
- RF reported that he had provided a project update to SMG who approved the direction of the project and delegated progression of the next phase to the Project Board
- RF reported that a high level plan had been developed for review

### **3 Deloitte Output**

RF presented the Deloitte output and sought confirmation that the Board were happy with the direction of the proposals. RF asked SB for comments on the Strategic Review paper provided by Deloitte. SB explained that he had met with Deans of Research to discuss this and he would table a paper at the next board meeting.

Steve Beaumont (SB) raised concerns regarding the support for academics at the project management stage. He believed more detail is required on this part of the process. Graeme Milligan (GM) questioned the support available for projects and stated that support requirements need to be written into larger grant applications. RF advised that Colleges may require differing structures.

Catherine Schenk (CS) questioned the costing support available for pre-award. RF responded that the centre will provide the templates and that College staff would identify the resources required for the project. CS raised the issue that Research Councils templates differ and RF advised that the templates would be standardised as much as possible. Graeme Milligan (GM) reported that Research Councils are working on standardising their administrative processes. SB asked who would be responsible for multi-College / University level grant applications. RF responded that each College would be responsible for their own but that centre would consolidate.

#### **4 Phase 4 - Detailed Design & Core Team**

The Project Initiation Document, High Level Plan and Proposed Core Team documents had been circulated prior to the meeting. RF stated the importance of keeping the momentum going and that the plan was to have the system designed, built and tested by the end of August 2012. RF advised that the roll out plan may be impacted by REF requirements and resistance to change. SB advised that REF reporting comes from the research system. RF requested that JH/JL discuss with Jane Townson to ensure that this is taken into account.

MC emphasised that the impact of the new system on academics must be minimal and that there should be no fundamental changes made to the application process. SB stated that the system must undergo rigorous testing before being rolled out. GM advised that academic staff believe the creation of a new research system to be a positive change. CS asked what the plan was for data cleansing and LV advised that data was usually cleansed before the budget cycle but that this would be actioned more frequently if possible.

RF explained that the role of the core team would be to feed into the process and provide detail on system requirements. RF sought the Board's approval of the core team. Muffy Calder (MC) suggested that more than one academic would be required with knowledge of more than one Research Council. RF stated that the role would be time consuming and that the right skill set was required. JH suggested that the range of PI requirements could be covered through a PI Steering group. It was agreed that the group established for previous phases of the project should be approached to form the PI Steering group. Deans of Research raised concerns about the workload of Heads of Research Administration given upcoming deadlines, including the REF. Alice Gee (AG) suggested that some workload could be delegated within the Colleges to free up Heads of Research Administration time for the project. JH suggested that the commitment estimated would be approximately one to two days per week and explained that not all members of the Core Team would be required to attend every workshop, although it was likely that Heads of Research Administration would be required for most workshops. SB advised

that other research activity cannot be jeopardised. RF asked whether the project timeline needed to be extended to accommodate this which the Board agreed it did. RF also advised that there is a £500,000 budget which included backfilling staff time for the project. It was felt that it would be difficult to backfill the Heads of Research Administration role as thorough training would be required. JH will discuss backfill with Heads of Research Administration. It was agreed to aim for 1 workshop per week. MC requested that Karen Philips be asked to either join the Core Project Team or to attend the workshops.

The Board approved the design and plan subject to the review of impact on resources.

## **5 Funder Intelligence**

The Funder Intelligence document had been circulated prior to the meeting. RF reported that the strategic intelligence tends to come from PIs at the moment. SB advised that intelligence needs to be shared across Colleges. MC suggested that another column be added to detail thematic intelligence. SB requested that some of the operational intelligence should also be included within soft intelligence. Board members agreed that the approach to sharing intelligence across college needs to be agreed. RF advised that every member of staff involved has the responsibility to disseminate information gathered.

## **6 Communication Plan**

JH asked the Board whether it would be an appropriate time to circulate project information to the wider University, for example, via campus news. The Board decided that this would be too soon, but to maintain communications with the agreed PI group.

## **7 Risk Register**

SB suggested that REF should be added to the risk register. GM suggested that key project members' time be added to the risk register.

## **8 Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be held in one month's time / date to be confirmed.

## **9 Any Other Business**

There was no other business.

SB and MC left the meeting at 11:15. The meeting closed at 11:30.

## **Actions**

- Approach PI group to agree continued support **JH**
- Table a paper at the next meeting on Deloitte's Strategic Review document **SB**

- Liaise with Jane Townson to ensure REF requirements are covered in the new system **JH/JL**
- Discuss Heads of Research Administration commitment to project / potential backfill **JH / Heads of Research Admin**
- Ensure Karen Philips invited to workshops **JH**
- Extend project timescale to account for staff availability at workshops **JL**
- Review risk register / add additional risks **JL**
- Update Funder Intelligence document **JH**
- Arrange next meeting **KJ**

**End**

**Amendment to Minutes**

*The below amendment to be added to this minute as discussed at next meeting which took place on 23 March 12.*

“A discussion took place as to how the organisational design process will work alongside the system and process implementation plan. It was agreed that both parts should be dovetailed and completed in parallel.”